

V. REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Liang et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0016318). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Liang teaches a color display achieving color images by controlling contrast of brightness of a plurality of tidily arranged pixels. Each of said pixels includes at least two sub-pixels. Each of said sub-pixels includes at least two colors. Each line of said transversely-arranged sub-pixels is electrically connected together by a signal scan line. Each line of said longitudinally-arranged colors is electrically connected together by a data transmission scan line. At least two of said data transmission lines connect the same color in each line of said longitudinally-arranged pixels being joined together by a conductive line to be connected to the same driving part.

Claim 1 is directed to a display device provided in a gaming machine. Claim 1 recites that a pitch  $P$  between pixel units, each of which is formed by arranging each kind of a plurality of kinds of pixel electrodes which display predetermined colors respectively, and a distance  $d$  from the display device to a player in a normal game posture satisfy a relationship of:

$$P = \tan(\pi/180/NPLD) \times d,$$

wherein NPLD is a number of pixel lines per degree of the player's viewing angle and

wherein NPLD is an integer selected from the following range:

$$1 \leq NPLD < 40.$$

It is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 1. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach or suggest a pitch  $P$  between pixel units and a distance  $d$  from the display

device to a player in a normal game posture satisfies the relationship of:  $P = \tan(\pi/180/NPLD) \times d$ , wherein NPLD is a number of pixel lines per degree of the player's viewing angle and NPLD is an integer selected from the range  $1 \leq NPLD < 40$ . It is respectfully submitted that Laing fails to disclose anything regarding "pitch" between pixel units. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify the features of the applied art because such features are devoid in the applied art. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art.

Claim 2 is directed to a display device provided in a gaming machine such as a slot machine or a pachinko machine. Claim 2 recites that a pitch  $P$  between pixel units, each of which is formed by arranging each kind of a plurality of kinds of pixel electrodes which display predetermined colors respectively, a distance  $d$  from the display device to a player in a normal game posture, and a correction value  $\alpha$  satisfy a relationship of:  $P = \tan(\pi/180/NPLD) \times d/2 \times (1 + \alpha)$ , where the correction value  $\alpha$  is  $\pm 0.2$ , wherein NPLD is a number of pixel lines per degree of the player's viewing angle and wherein NPLD is an integer selected from the following range:  $1 \leq NPLD < 40$ .

It is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 2. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach or suggest that a pitch  $P$  between pixel units, a distance  $d$  from a display device to a player in a normal game posture, and a correction value  $\alpha$  satisfy a relationship of:  $P = \tan(\pi/180/NPLD) \times d/2 \times (1 + \alpha)$ , where the correction value  $\alpha$  is  $\pm 0.2$ , wherein NPLD is a number of pixel lines per degree of the player's viewing angle and wherein NPLD is an integer selected from the range  $1 \leq NPLD < 40$ . Thus, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify the features of the applied art because such features are devoid in the applied art. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is allowable over the applied art.

Claim 5 is directed to a gaming machine such as a slot machine or a pachinko machine that includes a display unit constituted by arranging in matrix a plurality of kinds of pixel electrodes that display predetermined colors respectively. Claim 5 recites that, in the display unit, a pitch  $P$  between pixel units, each of which is formed by arranging each kind of a plurality of kinds of pixel electrodes which display predetermined colors respectively, and a distance  $d$  from the display device to a player in a normal game posture satisfy a relationship of:  $P = \tan(\pi/180/NPLD) \times d$ , wherein NPLD is a number of pixel lines per degree of the player's viewing angle and wherein NPLD is an integer selected from the following range:  $1 \leq NPLD < 40$ .

It is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 5. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach or suggest a pitch  $P$  between pixel units and a distance  $d$  from a display device to a player in a normal game posture satisfy a relationship of:  $P = \tan(\pi/180/NPLD) \times d$ , wherein NPLD is a number of pixel lines per degree of the player's viewing angle and wherein NPLD is an integer selected from the range  $1 \leq NPLD < 40$ . Thus, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify the features of the applied art because such features are devoid in the applied art. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 is allowable over the applied art.

Claim 6 is directed to a gaming machine such as a slot machine or a pachinko machine that includes a display unit constituted by arranging in matrix a plurality of kinds of pixel electrodes that display predetermined colors respectively. Claim 6 recites that, in the display unit, a pitch  $P$  between pixel units, each of which is formed by arranging each kind of a plurality of kinds of pixel electrodes which display predetermined colors respectively, a distance  $d$  from the display device to a player in a normal game posture and a correction value  $\alpha$  satisfy a relationship of:  $P = \tan(\pi/180/NPLD) \times d/2 \times (1 + \alpha)$ , where the correction value  $\alpha$  is  $\pm 0.2$ , wherein NPLD is a number of pixel lines per degree of the player's viewing angle and wherein NPLD is an integer selected from the following range of  $1 \leq NPLD < 40$ .

It is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 6. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach or suggest a pitch  $P$  between pixel units, a distance  $d$  from a display device to a player in a normal game posture and a correction value  $\alpha$  satisfy a relationship of:  $P = \tan(\pi/180/NPLD) \times d/2 \times (1 + \alpha)$ , where the correction value  $\alpha$  is  $\pm 0.2$ , wherein NPLD is a number of pixel lines per degree of the player's viewing angle and wherein NPLD is an integer selected from the range  $1 \leq NPLD < 40$ . Thus, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify the features of the applied art because such features are devoid in the applied art. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 is allowable over the applied art.

It is respectfully submitted that there is adequate support in this specification for the amendments. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that there is adequate support in the specification in paragraphs [0026] through [0028].

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Claims 7-9 depend from claim 5 and includes all of the features of claim 5. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 5 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance over the prior art of record. Therefore, this Amendment is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action. Further, Applicants assert that there are also reasons other than those set forth above why the pending claims are patentable. Applicants hereby reserve the right to set forth further arguments and remarks supporting the patentability of their claims, including the separate patentability of the dependent claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers.


Furthermore, for any instances in which the Examiner took Official Notice in the Office Action, Applicants expressly do not acquiesce to the taking of Official Notice, and respectfully request that the Examiner provide an affidavit to support the Official Notice taken in the next Office Action, as required by 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2) and MPEP § 2144.03.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

  
Carl Schaukowitch  
Reg. No. 29,211

Date: May 13, 2008

**RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC**  
1233 20<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W. Suite 501  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 955-3750  
Fax: (202) 955-3751  
Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s):      Amendment Transmittal

DC312599.DOC